

SENATE RECORD VOTE ANALYSIS

104th Congress
1st Session

Vote No. 431

September 15, 1995, 10:41 a.m.
Page S-13635 Temp. Record

WELFARE REFORM BILL/Expanded Medicaid Coverage

SUBJECT: Family Self-Sufficiency Act of 1995 . . . H.R. 4. Wellstone amendment No. 2505 to the Dole modified perfecting amendment No. 2280 to the committee substitute amendment.

ACTION: AMENDMENT REJECTED, 49-51

SYNOPSIS: As reported with a committee substitute amendment, H.R. 4, the Family Self-Sufficiency Act of 1995, will overhaul 6 of the Nation's 10 largest welfare programs.

The Dole modified perfecting amendment would strike the provisions of the committee substitute amendment and insert in lieu thereof substitute provisions, entitled "The Work Opportunity Act of 1995."

The Wellstone amendment would express the sense of the Senate "that any Medicaid reform enacted by the Senate this year should require that States continue to provide Medicaid for 12 months to families who lose eligibility for welfare benefits because of more earnings or hours of employment."

Those favoring the amendment contended:

We are puzzled by the opposition to this amendment. Senators clearly recognize the importance of continuing Medicaid coverage for people as they move from welfare rolls to payrolls. Of the 15 million recipients of Aid to Families with Dependent Children (AFDC) assistance, 9 million are children. When their mothers get entry-level jobs, most of those jobs will not provide health insurance. Those children, therefore, will be at risk because they will not have medical coverage. Until those women become more secure in their jobs and can afford insurance, they should continue to get Medicaid coverage for themselves and their children. This bill currently will require such coverage, and the Wellstone amendment simply expresses the Senate's approval of transitional benefits. We urge our colleagues to support this amendment.

Those opposing the motion to table contended:

(See other side)

YEAS (49)			NAYS (51)		NOT VOTING (0)	
Republicans (3 or 6%)	Democrats (46 or 100%)		Republicans (51 or 94%)	Democrats (0 or 0%)	Republicans (0)	Democrats (0)
Cohen	Akaka	Inouye	Abraham	Helms	EXPLANATION OF ABSENCE: 1—Official Business 2—Necessarily Absent 3—Illness 4—Other SYMBOLS: AY—Announced Yea AN—Announced Nay PY—Paired Yea PN—Paired Nay	
Snowe	Baucus	Johnston	Ashcroft	Hutchison		
Specter	Biden	Kennedy	Bennett	Inhofe		
	Bingaman	Kerrey	Bond	Jeffords		
	Boxer	Kerry	Brown	Kassebaum		
	Bradley	Kohl	Burns	Kempthorne		
	Breaux	Lautenberg	Campbell	Kyl		
	Bryan	Leahy	Chafee	Lott		
	Bumpers	Levin	Coats	Lugar		
	Byrd	Lieberman	Cochran	Mack		
	Conrad	Mikulski	Coverdell	McCain		
	Daschle	Moseley-Braun	Craig	McConnell		
	Dodd	Moynihan	D'Amato	Murkowski		
	Dorgan	Murray	DeWine	Nickles		
	Exon	Nunn	Dole	Packwood		
	Feingold	Pell	Domenici	Pressler		
	Feinstein	Pryor	Faircloth	Roth		
	Ford	Reid	Frist	Santorum		
	Glenn	Robb	Gorton	Shelby		
	Graham	Rockefeller	Gramm	Simpson		
	Harkin	Sarbanes	Grams	Smith		
	Heflin	Simon	Grassley	Stevens		
	Hollings	Wellstone	Gregg	Thomas		
			Hatch	Thompson		
			Hatfield	Thurmond		
				Warner		

The Wellstone amendment, in effect, states that Senators believe that States should be required to provide transitional Medicaid coverage for 1 year as people move from welfare to the workforce. We disagree. As most Senators are aware, negotiations on the means of restructuring Medicaid are underway. One very likely result of those negotiations may be to turn the program into a block grant program. If the Federal Government were to relinquish control over Medicaid in the manner that is being contemplated than it would be unable to give any guarantees. However, that would not mean that welfare recipients, as they moved to the workforce, would be worse off. In fact, we believe they would be much better off. The current Medicaid system has severe problems. State administration could solve those problems. We know, for instance, that Tennessee has already been given some flexibility to redesign Medicaid for its citizens, and as a result more people are now covered at less cost. In the absence of any other reform we certainly agree that it would make sense to provide transitional benefits, but with a Medicaid reform bill on the horizon that will result in better services at lower cost, we are not about to endorse an amendment that endorses the status quo. We therefore oppose the Wellstone amendment.